

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3

4
 5 JANE DOE and ANNE RASKIN,

6 Plaintiffs,

7 v.

8 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
 9 FRANCISCO, et al.,

10 Defendants.

NO. C10-04700 TEH

ORDER FOR FURTHER
DOCUMENTATION

11 On April 4, 2012, on the second day of the jury trial held in this case, Lawrence
 12 Hecimovich, counsel for Defendants, was ordered to show cause why sanctions should not be
 13 imposed for his inappropriate questioning of Plaintiff Anne Raskin during cross-examination.

14 Mr. Hecimovich was required to file any written response to this order by noon on
 15 Friday, April 6, 2012. Mr. Hecimovich responded in the form of a letter, which he filed on
 16 April 6, 2012. In his letter, he made reference to a case in which he engaged in a nearly
 17 identical line of questioning of a plaintiff, and in which the line of questioning had been
 18 allowed over opposing counsel's objection.

19 Mr. Hecimovich provided the name of this case in his letter, albeit with some measure
 20 of uncertainty: he cites the case, noting it was his only prior jury trial, as *Hsu (?) v. Bank of*
 21 *America*. He provides no case number or specific date for the case, only the year, 2001.


22 Because of this lack of specificity, the Court has no means of accessing the records
 23 from this case, nor of referring to, or relying on, this ruling in evaluating the presently
 24 pending order to show cause.

25 The Court wishes to further examine the state court proceedings cited by Mr.
 26 Hecimovich. Therefore, the Court hereby ORDERS Mr. Hecimovich to file a transcript of
 27
 28

1 the relevant portion of the state court proceedings in the *Hsu* (?) case with this Court on or
2 before **Monday, May 14, 2012.**

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: 5/4/12



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT